

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

ONLY

CONFIDENTIAL

☐ SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM: F. W. M. Janney
Director of Personnel
5E 58 Hqs.

EXTENSION

NO.

DDA 78-0803/1

DATE

3 MAR 1978

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. Executive Officer to the
DDA
7D 18 Hqs.

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

2.

3. Associate Deputy Director
for Administration
7D 18 Hqs.

8 MAR 1978

4.

5. Deputy Director for
Administration
7D 18 Hqs.

8 MAR 1978

6.

7. Executive Registry
7E 12 Hqs.

8.

9. Deputy Director for
Central Intelligence
7E 12 Hqs.

10.

11. Director of Central
Intelligence
7E 12 Hqs.

12.

13.

14.

15.

TO 11
Re: your first question
on the "one or
two" stop question
policy. I am on
the hook on that
one. I will shortly
be in contact.

8 MAR 1978

has a copy

APR 1978

DJ/mj

TO 12:

pk note DCI's question
& comments: your actions
solicited.

P-1/11

DD/A Registry

78-2803/1

78-651/1

3 MAR 1978

3 APR 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence

FROM : F. W. M. Janney
Director of Personnel

SUBJECT : Promotion System, Titles and Fitness Reports

REFERENCE : Memo for D/Pers fr DCI dtd 27 Feb 78,
same subject

Attached herewith are responses to your request for information and/or certain actions regarding the single-grade promotion policy, titles of positions, career employee status and fitness reports.

STAT

F. W. M. Janney

Atts.

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

RESPONSES TO DCI REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION AND/OR
ACTION ON CERTAIN PERSONNEL MATTERS

PARAGRAPH 1: Single-grade promotion policy concerns.

RESPONSE:

In the Spring of 1977, the Office of Personnel conducted a study of the two-grade promotion approach vis a vis the present Agency policy of single-grade advancement. On the basis of this study, papers recommending adoption of the two-grade promotion policy for professional employees below grade GS-11 were proposed and considered at the Executive Advisory Committee meetings in May and June 1977.

The EAG requested further study in terms of a transition plan should a decision be made to adopt the two-grade policy. A transition plan was prepared and circulated by the A/DDCI to the Directorate employee advisory groups for comment. The responses from these employee groups to the A/DDCI were about equally split for and against a change in policy.

Further study was requested of the Office of Personnel which prepared a new proposal in October 1977 to the A/DDCI which recommended a procedure which while retaining the single-grade policy would accelerate promotions to the even grades (GS-06, 08, and 10) and provide more timely recognition and tangible monetary benefits to employees by reducing the extended (and lengthening) months-in-grade patterns between these grade levels. The earlier advantages to employees under the single-grade promotion policy are being deteriorated by the gradual trend of lengthening time periods for progression between the grade levels. As of this time a decision has not been made concerning these recommendations.

"To 11

"Re answer to your first question on the 'one or two' step promotion policy, I am on the hook on that one. I will shortly be in contact.

STAT

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

PARAGRAPH 2: The question of changing the occupational titles used for various groups of people within the Agency.

RESPONSE:

a. There are two facets or categories as regards the use of titles or terminology to describe the occupations of positions and personnel within the Agency. The first category includes the formal or officially designated titles and the second includes the general functionally-related and informal terminology used to describe occupational groups (or individuals within the groupings).

b. The formal or official position/people titles are based upon the governmental occupational titling established for standardized usage by all Federal agencies to facilitate the use of common criteria for properly classifying positions by occupational "series" or family titles and grades and for weighing employee qualifications to perform the duties of such positions. Generally speaking, official occupational titles are based on the fundamental nature and substance of the work being performed without specificity to the organization where the work is being performed. Nevertheless, the Agency utilizes a number of position titles which contain the word "intelligence"; such titles are applied primarily in the broad fields of research, analysis and operations. In general, however, the Agency adheres to Government-wide titling practices insofar as practicable to facilitate the classification of Agency positions through comparisons with published "Federal Position Standards" and similar positions established elsewhere in government.

c. As regards the use of informal terminology or titling of occupational groups such as "Communicators" for Office of Communications personnel; "Analysts" to describe NFAC people; "Support personnel" for Directorate of Administration people; and "Para Professionals" for non-Operations officer personnel in the DDO, there are no real constraints to using new or different designations to describe these categories of personnel--either to better describe the group or eliminate "titles" that are objectionable or generate negative connotations to a substantial number of individuals in the occupational group. Further study will be undertaken of the usage of informal titles within the Agency to determine the possible need for more appropriate designations.

Since our people don't have right to transfer under Civil Service, this seems of little value to us

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

PARAGRAPH 3: How does an employee become designated as a career employee? What type of a form is he given? Who fills it out and presents it to him, etc.?

RESPONSE:

STAT Career employees are those staff personnel who are appointed for long term service in the Agency; it does not include persons who are given temporary (one year) or reserve (one to five years) appointments nor individuals under contract. The categories of personnel employed in the Agency are described in [redacted]. While the career employee is subject to the trial period procedures, there is no differentiation in designation during the probation. The current regulation, dated 13 February 1977, is under revision to include the new provision for the three year trial period which became effective 10 May 1977. The instructions and guidances for the three year period are published in [redacted] which has the effect of regulation until the revision of published.

STAT

From 1954 to 1960 there was a program in the Agency for the review of the records of all employees who were at least 25 years of age and had served three years for conversion to membership in a "Career Staff". The intent of the program was to identify a corps of employees who agreed to serve anywhere at any time and whose performance was of such caliber as to merit special recognition, hence the "Career Staff" designation. A certificate was issued to the individuals selected and was usually presented by the Head of the employee's office. By the time the program was terminated in 1960, the designation had become pro forma and, within the time and age factors, with few exceptions for reasons of security or financial problems, all employees of the Agency were members of the "Career Staff".

Beginning in 1960 new employees were appointed in a "Career Conditional" status and the Office of Personnel made a special evaluation of employee records at the end of three years of service. Office of Security and Office of Medical Services records were reviewed, and component recommendations were obtained and if the results were satisfactory, a personnel action was cut converting the employee to "Career Status". This program was terminated in 1974 for much the same reason the "Career Staff" program was ended; the process was no more than a paper exercise. Those employees who had problems with either performance or personal behavior were identified in the normal course of events and appropriate action taken, and this review served no effective purpose.

(Continued)

CONFIDENTIAL - INTERNAL USE ONLY

The current policy for the Career Service or Career Service Sub-group evaluation of employees of all grades and periods of service at least annually, serves the purpose of determining levels of performance and identifying employees who have problems in any area of personnel management concern. We do not believe the personnel management system as it is designed to function requires additional programs for identifying special status. All employees, with the few exceptions of temporary and reserve appointees, are Agency career employees.

3 APR 1978

Seems to me that to get
teeth into this year probation
period there should be a
change in designation & a
certificate when employee
has successfully screened at
+3. It should be signed by
Dep Director

PARAGRAPH 4

Item 1: Is there a standard procedure within the Agency for whether or not a supervisor has access to fitness reports written in an individual's record?

RESPONSE:

Supervisors, by reason of their position and responsibility, have access to both the Official Personnel File and the "soft files" of the component employees. Both files contain fitness reports, with the soft file normally containing only the more recent ones.

Item 2: Should supervisors be entitled to see previous fitness reports which they have written and previous fitness reports which others have written?

RESPONSE:

There is no Agency policy that precludes supervisors from using previous fitness reports as guides or background in preparing a current fitness report. In fact there are times when it is appropriate to address items in previous reports, particularly where there have been areas of questionable performance and improvement should be recognized. On the other hand, many supervisors consciously do not refer to previous fitness reports to avoid a bias, one way or the other, created by old reports. Each situation dictates approaches to preparation of the fitness reports.

Item 3: Is there an inclination to be sloppy in fitness report writing by virtue of simply using past ones as models?

RESPONSE:

It is of course possible that some fitness reports are sloppily written and/or are a rehash of the employee's previous fitness reports, however, the reviewing officers, career management staffs, and evaluation panels and boards have a responsibility to insure properly prepared fitness reports and should be held accountable for abuses of this nature.

I'm skeptical of the availability of fit. reports. If a man/woman gets a poor eval. & subsequent reports read it, he/she is likely to be prejudiced. I think of this should retain only eval. & decision.

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

PARAGRAPH 5

Item 1: Do we have any statistics on whether different Directorates and Divisions have markedly higher percentage of Outstandings, etc.?

RESPONSE:

The "Outstanding" fitness report statistics taken from the APP reports for each Directorate are as follows:

<u>FY</u>	<u>E. SERVICE</u>	<u>DDO</u>	<u>DDA</u>	<u>NFAC</u>	<u>DDS&T</u>
1977	38.4%	12.7%	10.6%	6.0%	5.8%
1976	38.5	12.7%	10.1%	4.6%	7.5%

The percentages for "Outstanding" ratings in the DDO and the DDA are comparable, as are the ratings in the DDS&T and NFAC. The E. Career Service percentage is high probably due to the generally higher grades of individuals serving in the components in this Service. There is a general trend throughout the Agency to rate higher graded individuals at a higher level than the general population of the Agency.

Item 2: Have we ever thought about requiring the rating officer to indicate how many people he is grading in each category so as to have some check on whether he is excessively generous?

RESPONSE:

The DDO recently instituted a practice of having the component indicating on each fitness report the rater's history, i.e., the number of overall rating in each category since the record keeping was begun in October 1977. This information is used in their Panel evaluation process and the DDO career panels may make recommendations if a pattern of overrating or underrating occurs. We would recommend more experience with this process to provide for adequate evaluation of the system before considering it for other Career Services.

Item 3: How long since we've changed our fitness report form?
Is it the same for all Directorates?

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

RESPONSE:

The same fitness report form is used throughout the Agency. The last major revision of the form was made in 1969 when the rating system was changed from Weak, Adequate, Proficient, Strong, and Outstanding to the present ratings of Unsatisfactory, Marginal, Proficient, Strong, and Outstanding. There is at the present time a Performance Evaluation Task Force under the auspices of the Office of Personnel and composed of representatives of all of the Directorates studying the Agency's Performance Evaluation System (including revision of the fitness report form). The Task Force report has been delayed by a lack of available qualified officers to consolidate the report. An individual has now been assigned to pull the material together and a report and recommendations for any changes will be forwarded to the EAG for review and approval.